



THE JOURNAL OF THE
NATIONAL ART EDUCATION ASSOCIATION'S WOMEN'S CAUCUS

THE REPORT

Issue No. 5

Editor: Judy Loeb

Assistant Editors: Ruth Beatty and Marlene Keller

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT

Judy Loeb reports: Our Pre-session Program is now set. We hope that all of you have marked April 10 and 11 on your calendars and plan to meet us there. Registration forms for the Pre-session will be included in the regular convention forms to be sent out from N.A.E.A. Fee for the Pre-session will be \$10 which will include a year's subscription to THE REPORT. Forms will be returned to National.

The Executive Committee has voted to name the annual award given to an outstanding woman in art education after its first recipient, June McFee. This year the award will be given to Dr. Mary Rouse of Indiana University for her exemplary work in raising the level of professional aspiration of her women students. The award will be presented at a Champagne Reception during the Convention on Thursday, April 15, 4 to 5 p.m.

Meet us in St. Louis!

NATIONAL ART EDUCATION ASSOCIATION'S WOMEN'S CAUCUS
1976 PRE-SESSION PROGRAM

RISING ASPIRATIONS: THE FUTURE OF WOMEN IN ART EDUCATION

Coordinator: Judy Loeb

PROGRAM

Friday, April 9

8:00 to 10:00 p.m. Board Meeting

Saturday, April 10

9:00 to 9:30 a.m. Registration

THE MATERIAL IN "THE REPORT" MAY BE REPRODUCED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION PROVIDED THAT EACH SUCH REPRODUCTION CARRIES AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO THE AUTHOR OF THE SECTION BEING REPRODUCED.

THIS RESERVATION IS IN KEEPING WITH OUR DESIRE BOTH TO MAINTAIN AND ENCOURAGE THE HIGHEST POSSIBLE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TO DISSEMINATE THE INFORMATION WHICH WE PRINT.

9:30 to 12:00 noon Welcoming remarks, Judy Loeb

Introduction: Dr. Sandra Packard, Associate Professor
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

"A Profile of Art Educators in Higher Education:
Male/Female Comparative Data"
Dr. Jessie Lavano-Kerr, Dean for Women's Affairs
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

"The Female Dilemma in Art Education Today"
Dr. Elliot W. Eisner, Professor of Education and Art
Stanford-University, Stanford, California

1:30 to 4:30 p.m. Workshop A

"Assertive Training Workshop"
(limited to first 25 who enroll)

Dr. Bette Acuff, Associate Professor
Columbia University, N.Y.C.

Workshop B

"Creative Problem Solving"

Ruth Beatty, Coordinator of Art,
Ann Arbor, Michigan, Public Schools
Colleague of the Creative Foundation
S.U.N.Y. at Buffalo

and

Tom Dodd, Teacher, "Earthworks"
an Alternative High School, Ann Arbor, Michigan

4:30 to 5:30 p.m. "Female Clique"
A Slide Presentation
Renee Sandell, Instructor
Ohio State University, Newark

5:30 to 6:30 p.m. "Getting to Know You", social hour

9:00 to 11:00 p.m. "And Then the Beautiful Princess Rescued the Handsome
Prince" A humorous look at sexual stereotyping

Ruth Beatty
Tom Dodd
Ed Jacomo, Associate Professor
Alma College, Alma, Michigan

Sunday, April 11

9:00 to 11:00 a.m. "Building Professional Goals with Women Artist-Students"

Panel Discussion

Chairperson: Dr. Angioal Churchill, Professor
New York University, N.Y.C.

11:00 to 12:00 noon "The History of Women in Art Education"

Dr. Gordon Plummer, Associate Dean, Faculty of the Arts
State University College at Buffalo

1:30 to 4:00 p.m. "St. Louis Women".

Chairperson: Judy Loeb, Assistant Professor
Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan

Panelists:

Leila Daw-Printmaker

Mary L. Fifield -- Painter

Susan Eisler -- Sculptor

Mary King -- Art Critic, St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Cissy Pao Pui-Lai -- Sculptor

Mary Sprague -- Painter

Silvia Solochek Walters -- Printmaker

4:00 to 5:00 p.m. Work Sessions

Group A

"Sharing and Planning Session for Research Involving
the Status of Women in Art and Art Education"

Group B

"Position Paper Working Session"

Chairperson: Dr. Sandra Packard, Associate Professor
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

ADDITIONAL CAUCUS SPONSORED SESSIONS DURING THE REGULAR CONVENTION

- Monday, April 12, 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. General Business Meeting, Initial Presentation of the Position Paper.
- Thursday, April 15, 1:30 to 3:30 p.m. "Review and Preview", review of the Pre-Session, preview of the 1977 convention, and final presentation of the Position Paper for approval
- Thursday, April 15, 4:00 to 5:00 p.m. - Champagne Reception: Presentation of the June McFee Award to Dr. Mary Rouse.
- During the Convention there will also be an as yet unscheduled board meeting.

ADDITIONAL PRE-SESSION INFORMATION

Dean Hylarie McMahon and Professor Caroline Kelsey, both of Washington U., St. Louis, are acting as Coordinators of Convention Local Arrangements and will prepare a list of convenient restaurants for those attending the Pre-session. Elaine Godfrey, Associate Professor, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan and Margaret Hicks, Chairperson, Navarro College, Corsicana, Texas will supervise registration for the Caucus at the Pre-Session and Convention.

 WOMEN'S ART 1972-1976

Cindy Nemster reports: Recently, I was asked to make a statement as to how I viewed women's art four years ago in relation to how I view it today. As I see it 1972 was a watershed year for the women artists' movement. It was the year of the Washington Conference on Women in the Arts, the year of the exhibiton Women Choose Women at the Cultural Center, the foundation of the Feminist Art Journal and the Women In the Arts demonstration at the Museum of Modern Art. With all this activity I certainly surmised that large numbers of women were creating art although they were not exhibiting it. I also knew from my own preliminary art historical research that there was a rich storehouse of art of women of the past waiting to be tapped. However we were still at the probing stage and while evidence of productivity and accomplishment were everywhere the iceberg had not yet emerged. Moreover everyone was anxious about the nature of the art that would emerge when the iceberg surfaced. Would it be a genuine woman's art imbued with a unique female sensibility? And if it did indeed embody this elusive trait was that to women's benefit or detriment? Some people longed for a pure female art hopefully superior to the male variety; others dreaded its appearance since they feared it meant inferiority and stereotyping. Everywhere women in the movement debated the female sensibility question and factions formed on both sides of the issue.

Now in 1976 we are beginning to see the fruits of the explorations and activities begun in 1972 and even earlier. Exhibitions of women's art have proliferated throughout the country for the past three years reaching, perhaps, the greatest degree of impact with the advent of Focus (Philadelphia Focuses on Women in the Visual Arts) in which, during the months of April and May, 1974, the entire art community of Philadelphia donated a large portion of its exhibiton space to the exposure and discussion of women's art. In the major exhibition Women's Work: 1975 both the quality and quantity of female art became undeniable facts; no longer was there any speculation as to whether there was a considerable body of women artists let alone any who were fit to compete with men.

In the field of women's art history we have been accumulating more and more concrete evidence of women's past aesthetic accomplishments. Thanks to the efforts of historians such as Linda Nochlin, Anne Sutherland Harris, Eleanor Tufts, Gloria Orenstein, Ruth Iskin and many others who have contributed to the Feminist Art Journal our knowledge of our past heritage is becoming clearer and more concrete every day.

The female sensibility question, as I mentioned before, has not as yet been resolved but it has served as a positive catalyst in the work of many women artists among them Judy Chicago, Miriam Schapiro and Hannah Wilke. Even for those who are skeptical about putting labels male or female on their work, the acknowledgment of a valid female point of view has become a liberating factor. Would we have the acceptance of Sylvia Sleigh's male nudes, Judy Bernstein's big screws, May Steven's Big Daddies, Anne Healy's silk sculptures of Audrey Flack's Jolie Madame without the current climate of feminism?

All in all the years between 1972 and 1976 have been years of expansion and development through the formation of alternate support structures (women's cooperative art galleries, interart centers, professional caucuses, etc.) and through the creation of a variety of exciting new art forms and images that insist on emphasizing the personal and human aspects of experience. At this moment, however, we must not forget that the art world is still dominated by a male mentality that is coldly conformist (few women have made their way into the Metropolitan Museum or the Museum of Modern Art, few women are mentioned in survey history of art texts and few women are engaged as teachers on fine arts faculties.) It is up to us to make sure that these conditions are altered. It is up to us to make sure that the diverse and vital art now being produced by women will be given the opportunity to speak to future generations. In the early 70's we planted the seeds; now we must make sure they will be harvested.

Cindy Nemster is Editor of THE FEMINIST ART JOURNAL and author of ART TALK: CONVERSATIONS WITH 12 WOMEN ARTISTS.

WOMEN AND THE SUPREME COURT--ANY RATIONAL BASIS?

Daryl Lee Barton Negendank reports: In order to understand the U. S. Supreme Court's position in relation to sex-based discrimination it is necessary to understand the terminology. First of all, cases reaching the level of U. S. Supreme Court review have generally been brought on the theory of violation of the constitutional right of equal protection of the laws guaranteed to all persons by the 14th Amendment. To bring a case under this theory, one must tie the claimed discrimination to a governmental function or sanctioned procedure such as state legislation or state court rules.

From the wide range of cases charging denial of equal protection, the Court has developed two tests to aid the justices in their decisions. One of these tests is known as the "compelling state interest test". It places the burden on the state of proving the necessity of the legislation or action by demonstrating that alternative means of accomplishing the same goal are not available. This is a difficult task, and most discrimination subject to this test fails to pass. The problem, from a woman's point of view, is that this test has only been applied to "suspect classes" of discrimination; traditionally, race, color, creed or national origin, but not to sex.

The second test, known as the "rational basis test", is the one that the Court has applied to business or economic concerns faced with discrimination. In this test, the burden of proof is placed on the party challenging state action. There is a presumption that state action is constitutional, and upon the showing of any rational basis, the discrimination will be upheld. For years, sex-based discrimination cases have been tested on the rational basis theory. To comprehend this, one need only look at the case of *Goesart v. Cleary*, 335 U.S. 464, 69 S. Ct. 198, 93 L.Ed. 163, (1948). A Michigan statute required all bartenders to be licensed in cities exceeding 50,000 in population. However, no female could be so licensed unless she was the wife or daughter of the male owner. The statute was challenged in the mid-1940's and in an opinion by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, the statute was upheld. The following excerpts summarize the Court's position:

"Michigan could, beyond question, forbid all women from working behind a bar. This is so despite the vast changes in the social and legal position of women. The fact that women may now have achieved the virtues that men have long claimed as their prerogatives and now indulge in vices that men have long practiced, does not preclude the States from drawing a sharp line between the sexes, certainly in such matters as the regulation of the liquor traffic.

Since bartending by women may, in the allowable legislative judgment, give rise to moral and social problems against which it may devise preventive measures, the legislature need not go to the full length of prohibition if it believes that as to a defined group of females other factors are operating which either eliminate or reduce the moral and social problems otherwise calling for prohibition. Michigan evidently believes that the oversight assured through ownership of a bar by a barmaid's husband or father minimizes hazards that may confront a barmaid without such protecting oversight. This Court is certainly not in a position to gainsay such belief by the Michigan legislature. If it is entertainable, as we think it is, Michigan has not violated its duty to afford equal protection of its laws. We cannot cross-examine either actually or argumentatively the mind of Michigan legislators nor question their motives. Since the line they have drawn is not without a basis in reason, we cannot give ear to the suggestion that the real impulse behind the legislation was an unchivalrous desire of male bartenders to try to monopolize the calling."

Inevitably, one must ask "Where are we today?" Only a minority of justices, headed by former Justice Douglas, consider sex discrimination a "suspect" class. However, the Court is looking closer at cases alleging sex-discrimination than in times past. The Court's approach today falls somewhere in between "compelling state interests" and the traditional "rational basis". The terminology offered by some Court observers as an accurate description is "rational-basis-with-a-bite".

One recent case in which this new approach was evident is Ordway v. Hargraves, U. S. Dist. Ct., D.Mass., 1971, 323 F. Supp. 1155. This case affects both students and teachers at the high school level. The lawsuit was filed by Fay Ordway against her high school principal, Robert Hargraves, and seven other members of the local school committee. It stemmed from an outstanding school committee rule that provided whenever an unmarried girl, enrolled in the high school, was known to be pregnant, her membership in the school was immediately terminated. The evidence at the trial was clear that if Fay had been married, she would have been allowed to remain in class during regular school hours despite her pregnancy. In response to questioning, Mr. Hargraves could not state any educational purpose to be served by excluding Fay from regular class hours, and he conceded that Fay Ordway's pregnant condition had not occasioned any disruptive incident nor had it otherwise interfered with school activities. Mr. Hargraves did imply, however, that the policy of the school committee might well be keyed to a desire on the part of the school committee not to appear to condone conduct on the part of unmarried students of a nature to cause pregnancy. In light of the above testimony, the Court ruled in favor of Fay Ordway and reinstated her as a regular daytime high school student.

Fay Ordway's problem is not an isolated incident. According to the Report of the Commissioner's Task Force on the Impact of Office of Education Programs on Women, November 1972:

"Every year over 200,000 young women under 18 give birth. Usually these young women are expelled from school at the first sign of pregnancy. Out of 17,000 school districts surveyed in 1970, fewer than one third offered pregnant school-age girls any education at all. School districts that did allow students to study during pregnancy usually kept them at home or segregated them in special classes for various reasons--on moral grounds, for special protection or for convenience.

None of these reasons justify denying a young woman the right to regular public education with her peers. There is no evidence that pregnant students are morally contagious. Class attendance poses no greater health hazard to pregnant women than performing a job, doing housework or caring for other children--all things that women commonly do up until childbirth.

Expulsion compounds the already serious problems of teenage pregnancy. Of every 100 pregnant teenagers who leave school, 85 never come back. Rejected, cast out with a child to support and often no salable skills, these teenagers are nine times more likely to commit suicide than their peers."

The school administrators response to pregnancy in the high schools is not limited to female students. High school teachers have also had to contend with outdated thought patterns. For some reason, it was early decided that students also should not be exposed to pregnant teachers. Consequently elementary and high-school teachers were forced to leave their employment as soon as they reached four to six months in their pregnancy. The case of Cleveland Board of Education v. La Fleur, 414 U.S. 632, 94 S.Ct. 791, 39 L.Ed.2d.52, (1974), challenged this archaic rule and was successful. However, the Court still discussed the case in terms of the traditional rational basis test, stating:

"We thus conclude that the arbitrary cut-off dates embodied in the mandatory leave rules before us have no rational relationship to the valid state interest of preserving continuity of instruction. As long as the teacher is required to give substantial advance notice of her condition, the choice of firm dates later in pregnancy would serve the Boards' objectives just as well, while imposing a far lesser burden on the women's exercise of constitutionally protected freedom."

Significant advances have been made in the last decade to update school policies. However, it is difficult for traditional school administrators to admit problems in the first place, let alone take steps to correct them. Federal legislation has helped awaken some school districts. Title IX's --Prohibition-of-Sex-Discrimination could have the effect of denying federal funds to those school districts not in compliance with the guidelines set forth by the Act. Hopefully this possibility will cause school administrators to re-evaluate their current practices.

Daryl Lee Barton Negendank, J.D. is an Assistant Professor of Legal Studies at Eastern Michigan University and a member of the Michigan State Bar.

REPORT ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROPOSAL

In keeping with the regulations set forth in the NAEA's Women's Caucus constitution the board of directors presents the following proposed amendment to the constitution; this will be voted on at the business meeting during the convention, Monday, April 12, 4 to 6 p.m.:

If the President should be nominated to serve a second term the Nominating Committee with the approval of the Executive Committee may either (1) present a candidate who will serve two years as President Elect before assuming the office of Presidency or (2) may nominate no candidate to serve as President Elect during the President's first year of office.

REPORT FROM THE TREASURER:

Margaret Hicks reports: The current balance in the treasury, prior to this issue of THE REPORT, was \$336.47.

NOMINEES AND POSITION PAPER IDEAS STILL SOUGHT

Ruth Beatty (428 Sunset, Ann Arbor, Michigan) is still receiving nominations for officers of the Caucus. Sandra Packard (Art Department, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio still welcomes suggestions for the Position Paper. Copies of Tottering on the Brink: The Future of Women Art Faculty in Higher Education may still be ordered from Sandra Packard (\$1.50)

REPORT ON FORD FOUNDATION SPONSORED RESOURCE CENTER

Ford Foundation has founded a resource center to assist teachers interested in working towards the elimination of sex stereotyping. Write: National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, 1507 M St., N.W., Washington, D.C., 20036

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Gwenn Savat of New York City writes:

It is always disconcerting to see a woman referred to as Chairman. It is particularly upsetting when the reference is in THE REPORT of the NAEA's Women's Caucus. THE REPORT must help women become aware of the discrimination that such terminology implies. I am referring to "Margaret Hicks, Chairman" on page II of issue #4.

I think that THE REPORT is excellent and a much needed addition to the publication of the NAEA.

Margaret Hicks replies:

I felt discriminated against both in pay and title for eight years. This fall the new administration changed the title of all department heads from "Chairman" to Director. I am the only female Director at Navarro College; there are 20 males!

ARTICLES FOR THE NEXT ISSUE OF THE REPORT WILL BE DUE MARCH 15, 1976

SUBSCRIPTION RENEWAL

For those of you who signed up for THE REPORT in Miami this will be the last issue you will receive. If you are planning to attend the convention Presession the \$10 registration fee will automatically renew your subscription. If you cannot attend the Presession why not send \$5 now to: Margaret Hicks, Director, Art Department, Navarro College, Corsicana, Texas.

WOMEN IN THE ART ACADEME: 1976 UPDATE

Sandra Packard reports: About a year ago, I published an article, "A Personal Statement on Discrimination" (1) in which I attempted to present one woman's (mine) experience with prejudice in the art academe. Unlike my research publications which had attracted little notice and had even less effect, this brief statement brought considerable response. What surprised me most, however, was not the amount of response, but the degree to which so many other women shared my experiences. Women all over the country were writing and saying "me too". This was disturbing, but, at the same time the sense of support and sharing I received was exhilarating and hopeful.

Since that time, I have more fully researched the status and future of women in the art academe (2) and I wish I could say I retained that hope. What with the publicity from International Women's Year and the new visibility of women in art, our future should appear very bright. On the plus side, we have the new feminist movement which emerged in the 1960's and caused a rise in our self-image and aspirations for achievement, as well as a rise in our consciousness of sex discrimination and inequality. Since 1964, five federal laws and one executive order prohibiting sex discrimination in employment and education have come into being. (3) We now also have professional organizations, such as the Women's Caucus for Art and the National Art Education Association's Women's Caucus which have been established to support and foster women in visual art professions. In addition, women artists, historians and educators are gaining increased recognition in the mass media, professional journals and in colleges through women's studies courses. More opportunities for scholarships and grants exist today for women interested in higher education in art, and women artists are using slide registries, women's galleries, and protest activities to increase their representation in art museums. Thus, women are finally amassing the necessary credentials for employment and promotion in art departments. Finally, more women are becoming heads of households in an inflated economy and out of necessity are demanding equal pay and advancement in their jobs. These significant changes along with present governmental concern should be leading to more equal and open opportunities for women in every occupation, including the art academe.

Other, more negative factors, however, are counterbalancing this progress. A depressed economy, rising unemployment and the end of the baby-boom era in education are resulting in smaller college enrollments decreasing the need for college faculty. In addition, we are beginning to see a renewed emphasis on the educational basics of reading, writing, arithmetic and science, and a corresponding de-emphasis on the arts and humanities. Colleges are frequently viewed as vocational finishing schools, rather than institutions for cultural and intellectual development. These trends shift the enrollment in college departments away from personal enrichment curriculums such as liberal and fine arts and into business and other vocationally oriented fields. While enrollments in the visual arts have not yet been seriously affected, (4) they could decrease if employment opportunities worsen. A male backlash to women's aggressive demands for jobs in academe and equality in the male art world also exists.

With all the publicity being given to the feminist movement, the new laws prohibiting sex discrimination and with the establishment of affirmative action offices on college campuses, many believe that women are finally receiving equal opportunities in the art academe. The contrary is true, however. Women faculty in academe are barely holding ground and in art departments women have been decreasing in number since 1930's.

In 1972, 46 percent of all undergraduates and 37 percent of graduate students were women, less than 30 percent of higher education faculty were women; and this includes Catholic women's colleges, black colleges and two-year colleges which have comparatively large proportions of women on their faculty. (5) Even more significant, however, is that from 1939 to 1973, women faculty were declining in their relative representation and status on college faculties, even during the 1960's when there was explosive growth in higher education. (6)

A similar pattern exists in the faculties of art departments (studio, art history and art education). Women constitute over 50 percent of the undergraduate art majors and almost 50 percent of the graduate art majors, yet the percentage of women in art faculties has been decreasing from 22 percent in 1963 to a low of 19.5 percent in 1974. (7) The status of women in art administration is even worse. In 1970, women were only 5 percent of the chairpersons of art departments and only one percent of chairpersons of art departments in schools with an enrollment of over 10,000. (8)

The situation for promotion and tenure has also been discriminatory against women in the art academe. A survey of 164 art departments in American colleges and universities by White and White and sponsored by the Women's Caucus of the College Art Association found that of the 2,465 full time positions surveyed, 14.8 percent of the tenured faculty were women and 25.8 percent of the non-tenured faculty were women. According to rank, women were 30.2 percent of the instructors, 22.5 percent of the assistant professors, 17.9 percent of the associate professors and 12 percent of the full professors. (9) "The higher, the fewer" relationship prevails, yet they also found that in the art departments that have Ph.D.'s on their faculties, women hold 25 percent more doctorates. Thus, although women are concentrated at the lower ranks in art faculties, they are more highly educated on the average than their male colleagues.

The same patterns of bias also exist in salary differentials. Women in academe receive less salary than men of the same rank, years of employment, degree, productivity and work activities. (10) In 1974, women's salaries were 83.2 percent of men's salaries. (11) That is approximately a \$2000 to \$2500 differential. (12) In a well controlled study, Astin and Bayer found that sex is a better independent predictor of salary in academia than such other factors as number of years of professional employment, whether one holds a doctorate and number of books published. (13)

These figures are highly suggestive of discriminatory practices in hiring and promotion in all areas of academe. What is most alarming about these figures, however, is that while there appears to be a trend toward the employment of more women in faculty positions in general, there is a continued decrease in the proportion and status of women on art faculties. (14)

Thus, the future for women in the art academe does not look overly hopeful to me. Present discrimination, a shrinking job market and a time of financial entrenchment in institutions of higher education will probably mean smaller salary gains and fewer jobs for everyone, particularly women. The current statistics on the status of women art faculty and the ineffectiveness of affirmative action programs (15) so far also give no indication for future improvements in salary, rank, or tenure of women. While it cannot be denied that male attitudes are becoming more accepting of women artists and teachers, this new openness is not reflected in concrete opportunities for women. The one hopeful factor lies in the changes in ourselves; in our increasing ability and willingness to utilize legislative action, group power and personal fortitude to achieve our equal share of the pie.

References

1. Packard, Sandra, "A Personal Statement on Discrimination", Art Education, Vol. 27, No. 9, December, 1974.
2. Packard, Sandra, "Tottering on the Brink: The Future of Women Art Faculty in Higher Education", The National Council of Art Administrators Report, Peoria, Illinois, 1976.

3. McCune, Shirley, "Discrimination is Against the Law", The Awareness Game, Vol. 6, No. 9, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, November, 1973.
4. The Art Reporting Service, Vol. 5, No. 11, January 20, 1975.
5. "Salaries Paid and Salary-Related Practices in Higher Education", National Education Association, Research, 1971-72, Washington, D.C., 1972.
6. Opportunities for Women in Higher Education, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, September, 1973.
7. Mills, Fred and McCulley, Clyde, Editors, "The Status of Art Departments in Higher Education Paper Two: The Art Department: Its Students and Faculty", Research and Information Bulletin of the National Council of Art Administrators, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois, 1974.
8. Harris, Ann, "The Second Sex in Academe", Art in America, May-June, 1972.
9. White, Barbara Erlich and White, Leon S., "Women's Caucus of the College Art Association Survey of the Status of Women in 164 Art Departments in Accredited Institutions of Higher Education", Women's Caucus for Art, January, 1973.
10. Astin, Helen and Bayer, Alan, "Sex Discrimination in Academe", Educational Record, Vol. 53, No. 2, Spring, 1972, pp. 101-118.
11. "Report to the President", National Center for Education Statistics, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, January 29, 1975.
12. "HEW: Less Pay and Rank for Women Academics", Newsletter of the Professional Women's Caucus, 1973.
13. Astin and Bayer, op. cit.
14. For more information, see Packard, "Tottering on the Brink: The Future of Women Art Faculty in Higher Education", op. cit.
15. Packard, Ibid.

Dr. Packard teaches in the Art Department of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. She is president elect of the NAEA's Women's Caucus and will assume office after the April convention.

 ENID ZIMMERMAN will coordinate a bulletin board at the Caucus' registration table at the NAEA convention. Bring along any information on activities with women in art or art education which you would like to have posted.

 WE STILL HAVE many areas and positions open for anyone who would like to be active in the Women's Caucus. If you are interested please write. Chairs and members needed for:

1. National Conference Program Committee
2. Grants and Scholarships for Women Committee
3. Position Paper Committee
4. Research on the Status of Women in Art Education committee
5. Education and Publicity committee

Write and volunteer to Sandy Packard, Department of Art, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056

ANN ARBOR MI
LEARNWHITE SCHOOL
800 BOULE
ANN ARBOR MI 481

ANN ARBOR MI
FEB 29
M J
1976
46



No longer
at this address.

RETURNED
TO
SENDER
Addressee unknown

... Ave. Apt #2
... ville, Fla. 32603

ANN ARBOR MI
FEB 29
M J
1976
46

